DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 265 599 CS 505 185

AUTHOR Ugbah, Steve; And Others
TITLE Organizational Mavericks and Innovation: A Triangulation Study of Culture.
PUB DATE Nov 85
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (71st, Denver, CO, November 7-10, 1985).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Business Communication; *Communication Apprehension; *Communication Research; Employee Attitudes; *Organizational Communication
IDENTIFIERS Organizational Behavior; *Organizational Culture; *Organizational Mavericks; Organizational Research

ABSTRACT

A study examined the communicative behavior of mavericks as they relate to innovation in organizations and the impact of such non-conforming behavior on organizational change. Two approaches were used: (1) studying organizational life from the cultural perspective and (2) collecting both qualitative and quantitative data. Subjects, 32 employees of a medium-sized midwestern corporation, completed a questionnaire measuring their communication style, apprehension, and eagerness to communicate with others across a variety of contexts. All subjects were also interviewed. Results indicated that organizational mavericks were more eager to communicate than non-mavericks and were less apprehensive about a number of communication situations. However, it appeared that skillful mavericks did not want to be identified as separate from the group, so loosely structured organizations were more likely to facilitate maverick behavior. (DF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED265599

ORGANIZATIONAL MAVERICKS AND INNOVATION:

A TRIANGULATION STUDY OF CULTURE.

Steve Ugbah
Cam Brammer
Chad Compton
Glenn Ray
Sue DeWine

Ohio University,
Athens, Ohio 45701

(614)-594-6835

Paper Presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention,
Denver, Colorado, 1985.

CS 505 185

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Steve D. Ugbah
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

INTRODUCTION

The Encyclopedia Americana defines a maverick as "...an unbranded calf that strays from the herd in open pastureland...". In current usage, it refers to any person who stands apart from his/her group.

Behavioral scientists have largely ignored mavericks in management literature. According to McMurry (1974), this can be attributed to the fact that the maverick has not been previously identified as a type, and his/her tactics are at variance with those of participative management and the collaborative decision-making process.

The lack of literary attention notwithstanding, the significance of mavericks in contemporary organizations lies in the fact that their behavior is more in line with the tough realities of the business world where numerous management approaches are constantly being introduced to keep abreast with the dynamic business environment. McMurry (1974) cited individuals such as the McCormicks, the Fords, and the Rockefellers as non-conformists, innovators, and whose behaviors have made them "mavericks" in the eyes of their contemporaries. These individuals were autocratic to some extent, direct, and did not practice the democratic-participative management system. Others, such as John DeLorean and Retired Navy Admiral Hyman Rickover (The New York Times), also fall within this category.

In recent years, a great deal of attention has been focused on a concern that American industry is lacking such innovators and innovative processes in general (Kanter, 1983; Ouchi, 1981; Peters &

Waterman, 1982). Kanter (1983) has observed that it is individuals in organizations that "... come up with new ideas, ...develop creative responses, and ... push for change before opportunities disappear or minor irritants turn into catastrophes ... Innovations are designed, not by machines, but by people" (p.18). She goes on to note that corporate America needs to be "reinfused... with the entrepreneurial spirit responsible for America's success in the past" (p. 23). While there is a great deal to be done with this "reinfusing," one of the first steps is to develop a fuller understanding of the communicative behaviors of those who are able to facilitate innovation within organizations.

The purpose of this study was to examine the communicative behavior of mavericks as they relate to innovation in the organization. Can mavericks be identified by other organizational members? What impact do their communicative behaviors have on the process of innovation in the organization? How do they perceive themselves in the organizational context? As an interpretive approach to studying innovations, these types of questions were used as a general framework to guide our investigation. Since this study focuses on management, management style and communication style will be used interchangeably. By management, we do not imply a special category of individuals in the organization. The use of the word connotes the directing, coordinating, and controlling of the operations which make up the organization. In this context, everyone in the organization is involved in the organization's activity in one way or another.

REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

Mavericks

McMurry (1974) distinguished between "mavericks" and "maverick executives." He defined general organizational mavericks as those non-conformists who are eccentric, recalcitrant, and usually rebels without a cause. These have no true leadership qualities and do not desire to learn the techniques and strategies that might make them good managers. Also, organizational mavericks are more obsessed and anxious with the trappings of power than the "maverick executives" who exhibit freedom from anxiety and the problems arising from it. According to McMurry, therefore, the notable features of a maverick executive are his/her exceptional drive, courage, optimism, and decisiveness.

Often, writers have examined behaviors that are different from the norm and referring to them as "deviant". Leeds (1964) discussed non-conformity in terms of the "enclave" in organizations. She contends that the fate of a non-conformist who occupies the position of responsibiltity is usually relegation to an innocuous position. While publicly challenging the efficacy of existing norms and their applicability to specific situations, the non-conformist hopes to change such norms without necessarily destroying the organization.

In his work on deviance, Simmons (1969) asserted that any "theory" of deviance is much more than an abstract set of notions about its causes, nature and consequencies -- it is an implicit perspective from which the phenomenon is viewed. As a result, social and behavioral scientists have approached the notion of deviance with prior images which brand the so-called deviant's attitudes and

reactions somewhat independent of the deviant's actual character or behavior. These prior images fall within some of these categories: the deviant is sick, the deviant is a boat-rocker and interferes with the smooth running of the group, deviance is a violation of someone's moral standards, the deviant is a hero, or the deviant is a human being with a few quirks and some special problems.

Simmons (1969) defines deviance as "the tendency on the part of one or more of the component actors to behave in such a way as to disturb the equilibrium of the interactive process within a given system" (p.16). Farrell and Swigert (1982) noted that deviance may not be evidence of lack of organization or the failure of social control, but a product of the same social processes that shape conforming behavior.

Most deviance studies have focussed primarily on behavior that is not normative, that is, behavior that is held in disrepute by most people in a given social context. Other studies focusing on this issue have resulted in empirical case studies or rationales for the import of the collective definition process (Conrad, 1975; Conrad & Schneider, 1980; Levine, 1978; Markle & Troyer, 1979; Nuehring & Markle, 1974; Pfohl, 1977; Schneider, 1978; Spector & Kitsuse, 1977). These deviance studies, however, have failed to produce an explicit framework relating rule creation to the broader theoretical conceptions of social processes and the structural order (Troyer & Markle, 1982). The purpose of the current work is to look at the impact of such non-conforming behavior on organizational change.

Organizational Innovation and Change

"Change" and "Innovation" have been defined as "to make different in some particular; to give a different position, course or direction to" and "a new idea, method or device; the introduction of something new," respectively (Webster's Dictionary, 1983). Kanter (1983) combines these two terms and asserts that they involve the notion of "process". According to her, change involves the crystallization of new action possibilitites -- new policies, behaviors, patterns, methodologies, products or market ideas -- based upon reconceptualized patterns in the organization. Furthermore, Kanter contends that the architecture of change involves the design and reconstruction of new patterns, or the reconceptualization of old ones, thereby making new and, hopefully, productive actions possible (p. 279). From the foregoing, it becomes apparent that both "change" and "innovation" have and can be used interchangeably within the organizational realm.

Innovations can be brought about in an organization in several ways. Rogers & Rogers (1976) have asserted that a total destruction of the organization will bring about change within the organization. This is indeed an extreme view about the concept of change within an organization. A less extreme case is structural change through the introduction of communication technology. Another approach is through departmental reorganization. Finally, there is the changing of individuals within the organization.

In The Change Masters, Kanter alludes to the fact that change/innovation within an organization is an elusive concept because of the difficulty in accurately measuring it. She further states that what is

usually viewed as change or innovation may only be a reconceptualization of existing organizational patterns.

Etzioni (1964) stated that an organization is a social group that has been deliberately and consciouly constructed in order to seek specific goals. In contrast, most, if not all groups strive to accomplish certain goals, many of which are general and non-specific. In organizations, however, goals are clearly stated and well understood.

In comparison to groups, organizations possess these additional qualities: a hierarchy, division of labor, and formalized rules and regulations. In spite of these characteristics, organizations, just like people, are in a constant state of flux -- changing and adapting to their environment. That is why it is pertinent to investigate mavericks within organizations, since they are said to kick against the status quo, and establish other communicative or management patterns in conjunction with their perceptions of the dynamic environments within which they operate. These mavericks are then instrumental to the establishment of cultures within their organizations which we would call "innovative cultures."

THEORETICAL APPROACHES

There are two general approaches we used in this study to examine organizational mavericks: organizational culture as a metaphor and triangulation of qualitative and quantitative techniques. The advocates of the cultural metaphor argue that it is useful in making accessible many important questions about organizational life that

have traditionally been ignored (Pacanowsky & O'Donnell-Trujillo, 1982). Studying organizational life from the cultural perspective has been presented as a way of addressing what it means to be human in today's organization and, to ecsape traditional management overtones that typify organizational research. Since the culture of an organization defines a finite number of kinds of situations, it also provides organizational members with productive rules which enable them to act appropriately in each situation, even though no two situations (or persons) are exactly alike. Hawes (1979) points out that the processes of writing and talking become primary data because talking and writing constitute, as well as reflect social reality.

Geertz (1973) described "thick description" as an in-depth analysis of life inside a group. He indicated that cultural analysis "penetrates into the very body of the object ... that is, we begin with the interpretations of what our informants are up to, and then systematize those ... analysis ... in sorting out the structures of signification" (p. 15). This type of analysis is new to the field of organizational communication and researchers are only begining to approach such levels of examination. Conquergood (1984) emphasised this when explainig that the cultures are not passive, static things ... cognitive activity of the real life individual is largely devoted to building the culture, patching it here and trimming it there, according to the exigencies of the day" (p. 2).

The other approach used in this study was to triangulate the methods and collect both qualitative and quantitative data. Faules (1982) has suggested this as the best combination of research methods

in order to cross-check the research conclusions of any one method. Coming from differing viewpoints towards the same phenomenon, Faules contends, yields convergent validity.

PROCEDURES

Research Setting

The organization is a medium-sized midwestern corporation which specializes in the manufacture and distribution of oil field equipment, storage tanks and pressure vessels, heater treaters, gas production units, and oil and gas separators. The research and development unit has had recent successes in innovations in wellsite monitoring processes.

Since our concern was with innovation and organizational culture, the R & D unit of the company provided an initial attractive research setting because of its representative characteristics. Its management and the approximately 33 employees were in close proximity. It was large enough to be regarded as a complex organization, taking into consideration the levels of technological sophistication, but yet small and compact enough to be comprehensively managed. The main plant which is located approximately 20 miles from the R & D unit was also included in the study. The organization has an overall staff strength of 300.

A cross section of organizational members participated in semi-structured interviews. The subjects included senior level managers and other employees from all units. The subjects were first asked for their definition and understanding of the term "maverick." Once a common understanding of the term between the researcher and the sub-

ject was established, organizational members were then asked to nominate individuals within the organization whom they felt fitted the description of an organizational maverick. All individuals who received more than two nominations were interviewed. All subjects were asked to complete a self-report instrument measuring communication style, communication eagerness, and communication apprehension. Thirty two interviews were completed and trancribed. Data analysis proceeded through seven steps.

First, each team member reviewed the transcriptions individually and generated potential categories and meanings from the interviews. Second, the research team compared field notes and generally assessed organizational mavericks and innovation in the organization. This dicussion was taped and later reviewed. General themes in the data were then identified. A third step involved research members taking one of the identified themes or issues and reviewing the trancripts again and analyzing the theme with illustrations. The fourth step was to conduct statistical analysis on the questionnaires -- t-tests between mavericks and non-mavericks and standard reliability tests on the three parts of the self-report instrument. The fifth step was a second analysis session by the research team where individual assessments were presented and discussed. Conclusions were reached on findings about the grounded-theory categories that were developed. The sixth and seventh steps were to present these final conclusions to another research team who had not been directly involved in the data collection, but was familiar with the research process and to present final conclusions to the client (a cross section of organizational

members) for verification of results. Rarely do organizational communication researchers cross-check their conclusions against the perceptions of the organizational members.

INSTRUMENTS

The instrument used to gather the quantitative portion of our data was a combination of three different but compatible instruments: the PRCA Organization Form (Scott, McCroskey & Sheahan, 1978) , the Communication Eagerness Instrument (DeWine & Pearson, 1984), and a portion of Norton's Communication Style Instrument (Norton, 1978, 1983).

The Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA), was originally introduced by McCroskey (1970). This instrument consisted of 25 statements about one's communication with other people. It purports to measure the level of apprehension a person has to communicating. Reliability was reported to be .90 and higher.

Scott, McCroskey, and Sheahan (1978) then developed another version of the PRCA with 20 items specifically for members of organizations. Oral communication is considered to be one of the most important ingredients to organizational success. Since our concern was with the communication patterns of organizational mavericks within organizations, their level of apprehension about communication events compared to non-mavericks was of interest. This version of the PRCA was a combination of four items from the original PRCA, five from Lustig's Verbal Reticence Scale, four from Heston & Paterline's Unwillingness to Communicate Scale, and seven new items specifically

developed for the organizational setting.

Internal reliabilty of this instrument was previously determined to be .91 using the split-half procedure. Concurrent validity was shown to be .90 between the original PRCA and the PRCA-Organization Form. Predictive validity was also confirmed (Scott, McCroskey & Sheahan, 1978).

The Communication Eagerness Scale is a 21-item instrument developed by DeWine and Pearson (1984), as an attempt to study those persons who enjoy communicating and who seek out opportunities to communicate. DeWine & Pearson maintain that this construct is not merely the antithesis of McCroskey's Communication Apprehension construct. There may well be those individuals who are eager to communicate but still fear to do so. The Communication Eagerness instrument is believed to measure a "state communication behavior." This means that, rather than being a personality variable which is constant regardless of time, the state communication behavior varies according to the situation in which it is observed.

Cronbach's Alpha (reliability tests) were reported at .72. Validity of the instrument was measured on three levels and confirmed. Content validity was determined through factor analysis. Construct validity was checked by comparing a subject's responses on five other self-report instruments and responses on the Communication Eagerness Scale. The criterion-related validity measurement involved comparing responses on the Communication Eagerness Scale to observations of the subject's communication interaction with a stranger (Pearson, DeWine & Willer, 1984).

The third part of our instrument was taken from Norton's Communicator Style Instrument (Norton, 1983). According to Norton, communicator style affects both our self-identity and perceptions others have of us (p. 19). By definition, mavericks are unique individuals. This instrument is utilized to compare and contrast the communication styles of both mavericks and nonmavericks.

Norton's instrument involves ten sub-constructs. For our study, a decision was made to focus on only four of the sub-constructs: dominance, dramatism, animation, and impression-leaving. Four statements were chosen from each of these areas. The dominant variable included statements concerning physical manifestations and nonverbal and psychological correlates of dominance. Dramatic communicators are those who give additional information to the literal content as to how to interpret the context. Animated communicators give such nonverbal messages as sustained eye contact, many facial expressions and frequent gestures. The Impression-Leaving variable is determined by whether or not the communicator is remembered because of the communication stimuli he/she projects. Norton (1978) reported the internal reliability of the four subconstructs as: dominant = .82; dramatic = .68; animated = .56; and impression-leaving = .69.

The overall reliabilty of our questionnaire instrument using the Split-half method (a combination of the three instruments) was .91. For the three instruments, we found the following reliabilty coefficients alpha =.72; PRCA alpha =.90; and Norton's Communication Style alpha =.88 (see Table 1). The respondents were asked to rate themselves on a Likert-type scale of 1 to 5 -- 1 being Strongly Agree

and 5 being Strongly Disagree.

ANALYSES (RESULTS)

Overview of the Organization

During the course of our interviews, we were able to gather information that proved useful in understanding the innovative processes at work in the organization. Information about the organization's structure, philosophical assumptions, rules and procedures, and the environment are briefly presented below.

The organization's structure can best be described as "loosely coupled." The researchers were not able to obtain an organizational chart because one does not exist, even though this orgnaization has been functioning for almost two and a half decades. It appeared that some pride was taken in this fact. Throughout the interviews, members of the organization described the organization thus "... we are not a deep organization; we focus on breadth," "...we feel free to jump over the fence in order to help someone out," and that everyone in the organization "... wears three hats". This may be of particular interest within the context of innovative behaviors of mavericks because, as one organizational member suggested, "you loose something in an organization that has a high degree of vertical structure, you cannot see the integration process; here you can see how problems relate to each other and are better able to conceive simpler approaches".

The degree of openness was demonstrated, for instance, by the location of the offices. One building housed almost the entire organization. Most, if not all the offices were located on the same floor. Access to anyone was, therefore, physically simple and direct;

the offices were partitioned with large glass windows; it was easier to walk across to the CEO's office, or to look for the person one wanted, than to telephone. Written communication within the organization was minimal.

Many common themes seemed prevalent as regards the organization's philosophy. The CEO probably has an immense bearing on this philosophy. During the interviews, three recurring themes or notions were evident: the first was the idea expressed by both the CEO and others that "if it can be done, we can do it," "you have to fail to succeed," or that you should not be "immobilized by fear." Within the same line of thought, the CEO claimed the the issue was not simply a question of being "arrogant," but that he possessed an "arrogant confidence." Secondly, organizational members expressed a high value in one another with such statements as "all the workers have a lot of respect for each other," and "everyone is on the same level." The CEO's sentiments were also expressed thus, "I hate the notion that you are my employee ... we work together." Thirdly, hard work was looked upon as a natural occurrence. Organizational members were expected to work hard and "bring ideas forward" and "make contributions ... that's just expected." This notion was forcefully emphasised by the CEO as too much being made of "ego-building" and that if an individual is on the team he/she is "expected to contribute." This, ostensibly, discourages personality building thereby deflating the egos of the most important, most powerful, and most successful. It is an attempt to demonstrate that no single individual is too far above the rest of the pack, and that in the organization, all are equal. That is the

sense the CEO attempts to convey.

Just as organizational structure and philosophy probably impact on the innovative behavior of mavericks, so do rules and procedures. Information about rules and procedures is divided into three sections: informality, getting along, and openness in communicating. First, the interviewers unanimously perceived the organization as being informal. This is illustrated by such statements as "we are informal here ... not lax ... but flexible." Informality was demonstrated by the fact that the organizational members rarely made appointments to see one another regardless of the level within the organization. Rather, members simply used the intercom or strolled across to the next person's office to transact business. It is not to be implied that the organization is lawless. The sense being conveyed here is that the organization has rules and procedures but that these are informal and not written. The researchers first noticed this trait when on our first trip to be introduced to the corporate executives, members walked in and interrupted our interview in order to consult with the executive, unannounced. The second rule that seems to pervade the organization is that people all "... get along." Throughout the interviews, there were such recurring themes as "... no yelling and screaming," no "... bickering and fighting," and "... everyone here gets along," As one member put it "yelling and screaming happens but it is a 'no-no'." The final rule or procedure that was prevalent in the organization was its apparent openness. This was manifest by management and subordinates relating that if anyone had a problem or a concern, they could go directly and see the CEO without an

appointment. Such statements as "it is pretty much open house around here," and "it is an open relationship here," reflected this perception by employees.

It seems evident from the interviews that the organization's structure or lack of it, underlying philosophies, informality, and openness may all be interacting to create an environment where a variety of different kinds of persons can exist, one of which is an organizational maverick. It is important to note that the organization is similar to any other, that is, there are those people who have had innovative ideas implemented but never received recognition, and also persons who did not hesitate to describe the communication system as "rotten". What was unusual was the small percentage this group represented. Others are bound to suffer because of this lack of organization and are always receiving the resulting rush pressures. Even so, it seems that the organization may be accomplishing something unique, providing the climate for the existence of a variety of individuals -- mavericks and non-mavericks, thereby creating an "innovative culture."

Another theme that was prevalent across the entire organization was the vehement testimony of almost all organizational members that "... we communicate ... we all get along ... " Within the ranks throughout the organization, interpersonal work relationships tended to make the organization succeed both as a human social system and as producers. With the high premium placed on working together, or getting along, it did not come as a surprise that the organization showed evidence of semi-autonomous work groups even though there was no

evidence of attempts at team building. Instead, an innovative culture was created to foster interpersonal subtlety and intimacy, and these conditions encouraged cohesive work groups. The principal factor for this type of organizational orientation appeared to be the CEO.

Ouchi's (1981) assertion is that tradition and climate make up an organization's culture. More than that, the distinct characteristics which an organization acquires, for example, values, beliefs, or communication/management systems, are instilled throughout the organization by top management. This is achieved through examples and passed down to succeeding generations of workers.

Nominations

Organizational members were asked to nominate others they perceived as mavericks. Thirty-seven people were nominated at least once. A number of tendencies were noted regarding the way mavericks were nominated. Throughout the organization, nominations were made more frequently of peers and supervisors -- 89% of the 37 nominations were in these categories. Only 11% or 4 out of the 37 nominations were made by organizational members who were in a higher organizational position than the nominated person. It can therefore be discerned that nominators either look upwards or sideways in the organizational structure to find mavericks. The type of persons most frequently nominated were persons who occupied high positions and were perceived in a positive light. 62% of those nominated fell into this category.

Triangulation

Of the 32 individuals interviewed, 7 were nominated by more than two people as mavericks. All 32 interviewees completed the questionnaire measuring their communication style, apprehension, and eagerness to communicate with others accross a variety of contexts. Coefficient alphas were computed for all three instruments. These ranged from .72 to .91. Table 1 reports individual reliabilities of subscales as well as the total scale. All were acceptable and moderately high.

T-tests were computed between the mavericks and the non-mavericks. Significant differences were found between mavericks and non-mavericks on three subscales: apprehension, eager to self-disclose, and eager to communicate when the other person's behavior is not predictable (see Table 2). Thus, mavericks are less apprehensive about communicating than non-mavericks. Also, mavericks are more eager to communicate on personal topics and in more ambiguous situations than non-mavericks.

Finally, since McMurry (1974) suggests differences between "maverick executives" and "organizational mavericks," we then compared the CEO (who was frequently nominated as a maverick) and six other nominated mavericks. The CEO's mean on the subscales was converted to a Z-score and compared to the "maverick apprentices" on a normal curve. On animation, less than 10 percent of the maverick apprentice scores were above the score of the maverick executive. On the eager to communicate with a known person, eager to communicate with a new acquaintance, and eager to communicate on a general topic, less than

one percent of the "apprentice mavericks'" scores fell above the executive maverick's score (see Table 3). Examination of the means reveals that the differences were in the opposite direction from the expected results -- "maverick apprentices" were more animated, and more eager to communicate than the "maverick executive."

Cross-checked Perceptions

Once the data were analyzed, the research team sent a copy of the preliminary report to the CEO which was followed by an hour-long interview. This interview was conducted approximately six months after the initial data collection. The purpose of this cross-check was to validate our findings against the perceptions of behaviors of the CEO and the organizational environment. We sought to collaborate the following: (1) Was our description of the CEO's behavior true to the perceptions of the CEO? (2) Is the organizational climate described as "loosely coupled" accurate? (3) Have any changes occurred in the organizational environment since the data collection; and what lies ahead in the future for this organization?

The results of the CEO's completion of the self-report instrument indicated that his perceptions of his own communicative style did not differ from other employees in terms of eagerness to communicate and dramatic communication style variables. In our interview, he indicated that he felt his "style" was <u>different</u> from many others, and that it was his style that had helped make the company successful. However, his perceptions were based mostly on his philosophy of how people should behave, rather than a conscious thought about specific

communication techniques.

He did confirm our assessment of the organization as "loosely coupled." He reported that a business partner who had graduated from a "famous business school in the east" had advised him that when the income of the business reached the 5 million dollar level, he would nolonger be able to run the business in such an informal style. This partner, as well as a well known accounting firm, told him definitely that when the company reached the 10 million dallar mark, he would have to introduce stricter forms of discipline into the system. He was advised that he would absolutely not be able to run the company in such a "loose" style. According to the CEO, "When the company reached the 40 million dollar level, and I hadn't changed my style, they shut up." His rejection of an organizational chart was again reiterated based on the philosophy that "... who is incharge depends more on performance at any one time, not an organizational chart." His rejection of "discipline" or "regiment" is based on the notion that many organizations waste a great deal of time managing themselves and not focusing on the job. Says he, "Blame and guilt are non-productive; I will not tolerate them."

During the six months since the data collection, the industry experienced a drop in production due to current economic policies and less oil being produced. As a consequence of these policies and the shortfall in production, the company has had to lay off about 100 employees. This was not seem as unsual by the CEO. Rather he attributed this to the normal fluctuation experienced by business. He sees no need why his style of management will change in future and

believes steadfastly that his "maverick" style enhances innovation in the company.

CONCLUSIONS

Organizational mavericks possess communication behaviors that are unique from other organizational members. The quantitative data suggested that mavericks as a whole, were more eager to communicate and less apprehensive about communicative events. The qualitative data supported this conclusion suggesting their willingness and desire to communicate. For example, one maverick interviewee said, "I am very direct with my boss ... I am quick to get disagreements out of the way." Another maverick interviewee said, "I have not had any problems communicating with others. When I need information, I simply go to them and ask for it." And yet, another maverick interviewee said, "When I get on a subject, I tend to hang on it for too long." These comments indicate an ease with communication and a desire to talk for long periods of time. Additionally, these same individuals talked for long periods of time during the interview than other interviewees and seemed anxious to talk to us about their environment.

We also examined the differences between the "maverick executive" (here identified as the CEO), and "apprentice mavericks" (other organizational members identified as mavericks). Frequently, organizational members identified the CEO as a maverick. Yet when he was interviewed for the first time, he was reluctant to assume that identity for himself. For example, the CEO said, "Most people observe

my communicative style as 'high-roller' or 'dice-rolling' ... indeed from outward appearance, it may look that way ... believe it ... down deep, I am a conservative individual and certainly don't like to gamble. I would prefer to bet on sure things. Those things are few and far between." Our quantitative data would also support this notion since the "apprentice mavericks" were more animated and more eager to communicate than the CEO. In the cross-check interview six months later, the CEO said that he did perceive his style to be different from others. However, on further elaboration, the CEO talked more about his philosophy of managing rather than specific communication techniques.

At the onset of our research, we posed the following questions with these results: (1) Can mavericks be identified by organizational members? Yes, yet their perceptions of being identified as organizational mavericks were seen as potentially detrimental to the overall health of the organization. An example of this was reflected in the CEO's remark that "if something spectacular were to take place from an individual, I would almost look at that as a potential detriment rather than something great."

(2) What impact do their communicative behaviors have on the process of innovation in the organization? Even though the executive maverick in this study did not want to be identified and the uniqueness of members was denied, his philosophy of how the organization functions permeated throughout the organization. In turn, the apprentice mavericks enforced that philosophy which allowed unique changes to occur. Thus, they have great impact on change and

innovation. This assertion was substantiated by the CEO and reiterated throughout the course of the interviews by other organizational members. For example, the CEO said, "I won't tolerate anger," and another interviewee said, "I don't put up with supervisors yelling and screaming ..."

(3) How do they perceive themselves in the organizational context? Mavericks see themselves as team players. "You don't have to look at things like you are better than someone else. You just come in and work." "I have built an organization that expects you to work at a high level ... I hate the atmosphere that you are my employee, although I am the CEO. We work together." And yet another individual said, "I am very company-oriented. I believe that evrything is for the company."

The net result is that an organization that facilitates maverick behavior also allows mobility of manpower resources and ideas. This organizational structure appears to be "loosely coupled" (Weick, 1979), and the system is based on informality in rules, procedures and physical design of the organizational environment. This loose coupling facilitates maverick behavior. The more skilled the maverick, the less obvious they want their behaviors to be. The assumption is that the "system" works, but no one knows exactly how. As one maverick put it, "... if you try to analyze why this system works, you will not be able to identify all the parts. It just works because we allow it to ..." By not identifying the significant parts or recognizing unique individual behavior, these mavericks "protect" the organization. In this specific setting, the CEO who is frequently

identified as a maverick by others, establishes an environment that allows innovation to take place as well as communicating his philosophy to the apprentice mavericks. The apprentice mavericks then infuse the rest of the organization with these beliefs about innovation and work ethics. Simultaneously, all of this activity is not to be identified as "unique" or separate from the rest of the organization in any way. With the call for more innovations in organizations, we need to spend more time analyzing these organizational and communication climate variables that allow innovators to develop and prosper.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Conrad, P. (1975). The discovery of hyperkinesis: Note on the medicalization of deviant behavior. Social Problems, 23, 12-21.

Conrad, P., & Schneider, J. (1980). Deviance and medicalization: From badness to sickness. St. Louis: Mosby.

Conquergood, D. (1984). Drama, cosmology and culture. Paper presented to Speech Communication Association Convention, Chicago.

DeWine, S., & Pearson, J. (1984). Communication eagerness: A communication construct. Unpublished paper, Ohio University.

Etzioni, A. (1964). Modern organizations. Englewoog Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Farrell, R., & Swigert, V. (1982). Deviance and social control. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman & Company.

Faules, D. (1982). The use of multi-methods in organizational setting. Western journal of Speech Communication, 46, 150-161.

Geertz, C. (1973). The interpretation of cultures. New York: Basic Books.

Hawes, L. (1979). On characterizing organizations' cultures. Purdue Lecture Series on "Theoretical Perspectives of Organizational Communication," Fall, West Lafeyette, Indianna.

Kantner, R. (1983). The change masters: Innovation for productivity in the American corporation. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Leeds, R. (1964). The absorption process: A working paper. In Cooper et al., (Eds.). New perspectives in organization research. John Wiley & Sons, pp. 115-133.

Levine, H. (1978). The discovery of addiction: Changing conceptions of habitual drunkenness in America. Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 39, 143-174.

Markle, G., & Troyer, R. (1979). Smoke gets in your eyes: Cigarette smoking as deviant behavior. Social Problems, 26, 611-625.

McCroskey, J. (1970). Measures of communication-bound anxiety. Speech Monographs, 37, 269-277.

McMurry, R. (1974). The maverick executive. AMACOM.

Neuhring, E., & Markle, G. (1974). Nicotine and norms: The re-emergence of a deviant behavior. Social Problems, 21, 513-526.

Norton, R. (1983). Communcator style: Theory, applications, and measures. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Norton, R. (1978). Foundations of a communicator style construct. Human Communication Research, 4, 99-112.

Ouchi, W. (1981). Theory Z: How American business can meet the Japanese challenge. New York: Avon Books.

Pacanowsky, M., & O'Donnell-Trujillo, N. (1982). Communication and organizational cultures. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 46, 115-130.

Pearson, J., DeWine, S., & Willer, L. (1984). The communication eagerness scale: Development and validation. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Convention, San Francisco, California.

Peters & Waterman. (1982). In search of excellence. New York: Warner Books.

Pfohl, S. (1977). The discovery of child abuse. Social Problems, 21, 10-23.

Rogers, E., & Rogers, R. (1976). Communication in organizations. New York: The Free Press.

Schneider, J. (1978). Deviant drinking as disease: Alchoholism as a social accomplishment. Social Problems, 25, 361-372.

Scott, M., McCroskey, J., & Sheahan, M. (1978). Measuring communication apprehension. Journal of Communication.

Simmons, J. (1969). Deviants. The Glendessary Press.

Spector, M., & Kitsuse, J. (1977). Constructing social problems. Menlo Park, California: Cummings.

Troyer, R., & Markle, G. (1982). Creating deviance rules: A macroscopic model. The Sociological Quarterly, 23, 157-169.

Weick, K. (1974). Middle range theories of social systems. Behavioral Science, 19, 375-367.

Table 1

Reliability of the Survey Instrument

Scales	Alpha
1. Communication Eagerness Scale	.72
2. Communicator Style	.88
3. Communication Apprehension Scale(PRCA)	.90
4. Dominance subscale (DOMN)	.78
5. Dramatic subscale (DRAM)	.74
6. Animated subscale (ANIM)	.58
7. Impression-Leaving subscale (IMPL)	.85
8. Communication Apprehension (COMP)	.90
9. Eager to communicate on general topics (EGTOP)	.76
10. Eager to communicate when outcome is predictable (EOP)	.79
11. Eager to self-disclose (ESD)	.75
12. Eager to communicate with a known person (EKP)	.58
13. Eager to communicate when others' response is not predictable (ENP)	.84
14. Eager to communicate with new acquaintance (ENAQ)	.55
15. TOTAL	.91

Table 2

t-test between 7 "mavericks" and 25 "non-mavericks"

Variable	Maverick Mean***	Non-Maverick Mean	T-Value	2-Tail Prob.
Dominance	13.14	13.14	-.22	.828
Dramatic	10.57	11.44	-.61	.547
Animated	10.57	10.48	.08	.934
Impression-Leaving	10.28	9.88	.31	.760
Comm. Apprehension	44.14	52.88	-2.15	.040*
Eager-general topic (EGTOP)	5.57	6.84	-.54	.595
Eager-outcome predictable (EOP)	7.57	7.72	-.14	.886
Eager-self disclose (ESD)	6.28	9.36	-3.18	.003**
Eager-omm. with well-known person (EKP)	11.28	12.36	-.91	.371
Eager-comm. with new acquaintance (ENAQ)	12.71	14.76	-2.59	.015*
Eager-comm. outcome not predictable (ENP)	5.14	6.60	-.59	.560

* Significant at p< .05

** Significant at p< .01

*** Instruments were reversed-scored such that low means on the eagerness scale represented high eagerness; low means on the communicator style instrument represented higher levels of a particular trait; low means on the PRCA represented low apprehension.

Table 3

Z-scores for 1 "maverick executive" compared to the means of the "apprentice mavericks"

Variable	Maverick z-score	% of Apprentice mavericks above maverick executive
Dominance	-0.493	.69
Dramatic	0.227	.40
Animated	1.330	.09*
Impression leaving	.178	.43
Communication Apprehension	.135	.45
EGTOP	2.857	.002**
EOP	.895	.19
ESD	5.000	.000
EKP	2.260	.01 **
ENAQ	2.250	.01 **
ENP	.455	.32

* Significant at p< .10
** Significant at p< .01

Table 4

Z-scores of "maverick executive" compared to the means of 29 other organizational members

Variable	Maverick Exec. z-score	% of Apprentice Mavs. above Mav. Executive
Dominance	-.467	.32
Dramatic	-.088	.03*
Animated	1.000	.16
Impression leaving	.355	.35
Communication Apprehension	.608	.27
EGTOP	.958	.17
EOP	.542	.29
ESD	.923	.18
ENAQ	.350	.36
ENP	.289	.38
EKP	1.070	.13

* Significant at p< .10